

REMARKS

Claims 1-4, 10, 12, 14-21, 24, and 26-35 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over United States Patent Number 7,044,614 B2 to Levy (hereinafter “Levy”).

Response to rejections of claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Claims 1-4, 10, 12, 14-21, 24, and 26-35 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Levy. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claims 1, 10, 14, 15, 24, and 29 include the limitations of “...a compound applied to a control object to *form a designator* upon the control object, the compound configured to *react to visible and non-visible light by radiating visible light* and wherein the designator distinctly identifies the control object; and a non-visible light source configured to directly radiate the compound so that the compound *radiates visible light in the form of the designator and the visible light is of low intensity* so as not to distract a user and nearby people.” Claim 1. See also claims 10, 14, 15, 24, and 29. Thus present invention claims forming a designator that reacts to both visible and non-visible light by radiating visible light, and that is exposed to a non-visible light source and radiates visible light of a low intensity in the form of the same designator displayed under visible light.

As the Examiner points out, Levy discloses applying a photochromic compound to keys and/or keypads. Levy, col. 5, line 52 – col. 6, line1; col. 2, lines 34-40; col. 3, lines 34-36. However, Levy clearly teaches away from radiating light to form the same designator in reaction to both visible and non-visible light. Instead Levy teaches that illuminating the photo chromic

compound on the function buttons changes the appearance of the function buttons. As the Examiner points out, “...(the function buttons 112 can serve as the numeric and function keypads for the calculator when exposed to an external UV source and the same function buttons 112 cans serve as the function keys for a clock radio when not exposed to an external UV source; column 6, lines 4-10)” Office Action of January 25, 2007, (hereinafter OA070125) page 2, lines 17-20. Thus Levy clear teaches using non-visible light to change a displayed designator, rather than to display the same designator in both visible and non-visible light.

Applicants submit that because Levy does not disclose forming a designator that reacts to visible and non-visible light by radiating visible light, Levy does not teach each element of the present invention. Therefore, Applicants submit that claims 1, 10, 14, 15, 24, and 29 are allowable.

Applicants further assert that the Examiner has not made a *prima facie* case for combining the limitation of “...radiates visible light in the form of the designator and the visible light is of low intensity so as not to distract a user and nearby people...” with the Levy. “To establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art.” MPEP §2143.03 (emphasis added). The Examiner has not cited a reference that shows the concept is obvious. In addition, the Examiner has identified no teaching or suggestion in Levy to combine the low intensity concept with Levy. Absent a prior art reference with the claim limitation and a teaching or suggestion to combine, Applicants submit that the limitation of radiating visible light of low intensity cannot be obvious and that claims 1, 10, 14, 15, 24, and 29 are allowable.

Claims 20, 31, 32, 34, and 35 include the limitation of a positioning stalk. With regards to claims 20, 31, 32, 34, and 35, the Examiner argues that it is obvious that the external and detached UV light source taught by Levy could be mounted to the I/O device using a rigid or semi-rigid connector. OA070125, page 4, lines 10-15. Applicants respectfully assert that the Examiner has not made a *prima facie* case that the positioning stalk is obvious as the limitation of the positioning stalk is neither taught nor suggested in Levy, or in any prior art cited by the Examiner.

Applicants therefore submit that claims 20, 31, 32, 34, and 35 are allowable. Applicants have not traversed the rejections of dependent claims 2-4, 12, 16-19, 21, and 26-28, and 30, but submit that these claims are allowable as depending from allowable claims.

As a result of the presented remarks, Applicants assert that claims 1-4, 10, 12, 14-21, 24, and 26-35 are in condition for prompt allowance. Should additional information be required regarding the traversal of the rejections of the claims enumerated above, Examiner is respectfully asked to notify Applicants of such need. If any impediments to the prompt allowance of the claims can be resolved by a telephone conversation, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

/Brian C. Kunzler/

Brian C. Kunzler
Reg. No. 38,527
Attorney for Applicant

Date: March 26, 2007
8 East Broadway, Suite 600
Salt Lake City, UT 84111
Telephone (801) 994-4646
Fax (801) 531-1929